UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,604	12/08/2003	Srikanth Karimisetty	021756-002100US	4746

			EXAMINER
51206 7590 12/27/2006			ONI, OLUBUSOLA
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP			
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
8TH FLOOR		2168	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/27/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

> A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10/17/2006*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Response to Amendment

1.   The amendment filed on October 17, 2006 has been entered. Claims 1,9,11 and

16 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section

122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for

patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United

States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international

application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for

purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the

international application designated the United States and was published under Article

21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang

et al. (Pat No: U.S 6,584,459) hereinafter "Chang"

For claim 1, Chang teaches "a method of searching unstructured data stored in a

database" ([Col. 7, lines 54-67, Col. 10, lines 10-18, Col. 11, lines 34-40]), the method

comprising:

storing unstructured data in a column of a database table" ([Col. 3, lines 26-Col. 4,

lines 18, Col.7, lines 45-Col. 8, lines 43] where Chang's teaches of storing XML

document reads on applicant's claim language);

"allowing a user to identify elements in the unstructured data as indexed

elements"([Col. 14, lines 51-Col. 15,lines 1-10, fig. 4])

" in response to user-identified elements, creating an intermediate index into the

unstructured data from the identified elements" ([Col. 8, lines 10-17]) and allowing

a user to create queries on the unstructured data using the indexed elements" (Col.

8, lines 10-17, Col. 20, lines 5-40).

For claim 2, Chang teaches "wherein the queries specify at least one

value and an operation that is to be performed on an identified element" ([Col. 2,

lines 61-67Col. 7,lines 46-Col. 8, lines 40, Col. 9, lines 11-28])

For claim 3, Chang teaches "wherein the queries further include a start date and an

end date" ([Col. 19,lines 1-14, Col. 19, lines 56-64] wherein Chang's teaches of

date and end/start, reads on applicants claim language)

For claim 4-5, Chang teaches "wherein the unstructured data..." ([Col. 8, lines 18-42,

Col. 9,lines 19-28, Col. 12, lines 63-Col.13, lines40] wherein Chang teaches storing

XML in tables, thus teaches are synonymous)

For claim 6, Chang teaches "wherein XML fields of the unstructured

data are filled with transaction data from a database transaction based on a

predefined mapping to multiple data sources"([Col. 2, lines 18-28])

For claim 7, Chang teaches "wherein the multiple data sources are

comprise multiple tables of a database" ([Col. 2, lines 29-40] Chang's teaches of

plurality of databases and tables, reads on applicant's claim language)

For claim 8, Change teaches "wherein the unstructured data is part of an

electronic record stored in a common repository of electronic records that provides an

audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users of the system" ([Col. 8,lines 19-

40])

For claim 9, Chang teaches "a method of searching XML data stored in a column of

a database table in character large object (CLOB) format"([Col. 8, lines 18-42, Col.

12, lines 63-Col.13, lines40], the method comprising:

"storing the XML data in the column of the database table, wherein the XML data comprises

a first plurality of XML elements that conform to a first data type definition (DTD) and a

second plurality of XML elements that conform to a second DTD"([Col. 8, lines 19-40, Col. 9,

lines 14-28, Col. 10, lines 10-18, Col. 12, lines 35-48])

"allowing a user to identify elements from the first and second plurality of XML elements in

XML data as indexed elements"([Col. 14, lines 51-Col. 15,lines 1-10, fig. 4])

" in response to user-identified elements, creating an intermediate index into the XML data

from the identified elements" ([Col. 8, lines 10-17]) and allowing a user to create queries

on the unstructured data using the indexed elements" (Col. 8, lines 10-17, Col. 20, lines

5-40).

For claim 10, Chang teaches "wherein the first and second DTDs

include first and second XML elements, respectively, that share a common name but

represent different types of data and wherein the user can create a first indexed element that

represents the first XML element and not the second XML element and a second indexed

element that represents the second XML element and not the first XML element" ([Col. 8,

lines 19-40, Col. 9, lines 14-28, Col. 10, lines 10-18, Col. 12, lines 35-48])

For claim 11, Chang teaches "a computer system for searching unstructured data

stored in a database" ([Col. 7, lines 54-67, Col. 10, lines 10-18, Col. 11, lines 34-40]),

the computer system comprising:

"a processor" ([Col. 6, lines 15-27]);

"a database" ([Col. 6, lines 15-27 Col. 7, lines 54-67, Col. 10, lines 10-18, Col. 11, lines

34-40])

"a computer-readable memory coupled to the processor, the computer-

readable memory configured to store a computer program"([Col.6, lines 54-Col. 7, lines 2])

wherein the processor is operative with the computer program to store unstructured data in a

column of a database table" ([Col. 3, lines 26-Col. 4, lines 18, Col.7, lines 45-Col. 8,

lines 43])

"allow a user to identify elements in the unstructured data as indexed elements" ([Col. 14,

lines 51-Col. 15,lines 1-10, fig. 4]

"in response to user-identified elements, create an intermediate index into the

unstructured data from the identified elements"_([Col. 8, lines 10-17]) and allow a user to

create queries on the unstructured data using the indexed elements" (Col. 8, lines 10-17,

Col. 20, lines 5-40).

For claim 12, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given

above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 13, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given

above for rejected claim 4 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 14, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given

above for rejected claim 5 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 16, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 17, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 18, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 4 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 19, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 5 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 20, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 6 and is similarly rejected.

Response To Arguments

3.   Applicant's argument filed October 17, 2006 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments.

As per claim 1, applicant argued that Chang's teachings does not include "unstructured data". Applicant went further to explained "unstructured data as a well-formed XML document stored...". However, applicant also admitted that Chang's teachings include

XML documents. Similarly, Col. 14, lines 31-37 of Chang's teachings also includes

storing of XML documents, which emphasizes the fact that its not bound to just one

DTD, similar to applicants emphasis on the fact that XML data could be stored to a

variety of DTDs.

Applicant also argued that Chang's teachings does not include "intermediate index into

unstructured data in response to user-identified elements". On the contrary fig.4, step7

of Chang's teachings includes creating index based on users input. Thus teachings are

synonymous.

Conclusion

4.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to OLUBUSOLA ONI whose telephone number is 571-272-

2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 7.30-5.00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, TIM, VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBP   OLUBUSOLA ONI

Examiner

Art Unit 2164

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100